

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 94 04:30:09 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #628  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Sun, 5 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 628

Today's Topics:

                    "73's" (2 msgs)  
                    \*\* WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? \*\*  
                    440 in So. Cal.  
                    73s

                    NEED HEATHKIT POWER AMP DOCUMENTATION !! please read me ->

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 5 Jun 1994 05:00:10 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!  
ew032@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: "73's"  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

boy, yer a little anxious aren't you? It's just fun to use  
words that no-one other than fellow hams would know... 8)

73 de KE6GPS

--  
| Steve Miller | KE6GPS | San Luis Obispo, CA | stmille@ctp.org |

-----  
Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 09:44:42 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
nduehr@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: "73's"  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

RAY WADE (ray.wade@michaelr.com) wrote:

: WRONG! 73 means "Best Regards". 73's obviously therefore must mean  
: "Best Regard(es)", neither of which was or is intended to be used  
: on phone (voice). How people can get a amateur license and continue to  
: butcher C.W. (continuous wave, meaning using Morse Code \*NOT\* phone)  
: prosign is beyond me. This goes for QSL, QTH, and all other "Q"  
: signals. TRY TALKING ENGLISH. What in the Hell is wrong with that?

One of the local hams in Greeley, Colorado has postulated that the definition of "Best Regards" for 73 has been created by hams who didn't have any idea what they were talking about.

His best guess from his research is that 73 evolved from the old west in which the telegraph operators used to say "I will you my 73." Which was a darn good rifle in those days. It was eventually shortened to 73, and made it's way into ham CW morse jargon.

I'll keep his name and callsign from being published so that if any flames are brought about from this post they will be for me and me alone!  
;-)

(Ahem...)  
73! from Nate - NONTZ

--  
Regards,  
Nate Duehr

nduehr@netcom.com

-----  
Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 04:23:45 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
greg@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: \*\* WAITING PERIOD FOR LICENSE ?? \*\*  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CquEr3.8FH@spdc.ti.com> serafin@spdc.ti.com (Mike Serafin) writes:  
>Merle Rutschke (al372@cleveland.Freenet.Edu) wrote:  
>  
>: TO ALL:  
>  
>: Does anyone reading this message know the current waiting period

>: for the no-code Tech license from the FCC?

>

>12 weeks. KC5GRW received his Tech license, TODAY, which marked the exact end  
>of 12 weeks from the date on which the exam was taken.

And remember, when you vote for your ARRL director, that the League opposed  
the plan that would have had you on the air as soon as you passed, instead  
of cooling your heels, losing interest and code speed (if the latter applies)  
in the mean-time.

Greg

-----

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 04:19:47 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!greg@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun4.165915.9175@cs.brown.edu> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P.  
Deignan) writes:

>

>Oh, I understand perfectly. You want something for nothing. Gimme, gimme,  
>gimme "OPEN" repeaters so I can yak all day and not have to pay anything.

Imagine how far behind where it is now the packet network would be if  
the generous souls who run PBBS systems had the same attitude?

Where is the spicity of hospitality to the ham who happens to be  
cruising by on 101 enroute from San Diego to San Francisco?

I submit that most hams, who can afford to, will support a repeater  
group where they use the machine frequently. Some can't afford to. No  
matter. Hell, we've been known to give youngsters use of our old HF  
rig for an indefinite period, just to keep them on the air.

And that guy in the car, maybe he supports an open repeater in his  
area, and will make me feel welcome when I drive through HIS home  
town.

Our we can all band together in our little cliques and country-clubs,  
and re-hash the same thing on our way to work each day, with no fear  
of meeting someone who we don't know already.

Make a choice, ham radio.

Greg

-----  
Date: 4 Jun 94 19:56:10 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: 73s  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

PR network used to have a discussion about the right way to say 73s.  
As always it ended with nil result to great effort.

If it bothers one very much what signs the message, he can issue a  
search-and-replace command and wipe out what he/she doesn't like! Then we  
will have more interesting stuff to argue about :-)

73s 73's 70 trees DE 4z9dge Erik

-----  
Date: 5 Jun 1994 04:45:14 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
ux4.cso.uiuc.edu!ahall@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: NEED HEATHKIT POWER AMP DOCUMENTATION !! please read me ->  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello everyone,

I am a in need of the documents/schematics for the following:

Heathkit Power Amp.  
model HA-202

If you have them and would be either willing to negotiate for them  
or make a copy of them, please e-mail me. The Heahtkit power amp  
ha-202 is a 2 or 3 transistor c-class that had the option for a nice  
black case with fins on top. Very nice design, and unfortunately, something  
has gone wrong with it. I am representing Synton Amateur Radio Club  
of the University of Illinois for this, so it would benefit a ton of  
people if you decide to contact me. (we misplaced the documents  
unfortunately)

sorry about that last line there.

73's et hope to speak with you soon,

Allen Hall      n9rzc@uiuc.edu  
Pres. of Synton ARC UIUC      (W9YH)

-----

Date: 5 Jun 1994 06:04:49 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!jws@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994May31.172630.21416@cs.brown.edu>, <2sg0cv\$3rm@tadpole.fc.hp.com>, <joejarreCqwC9p.Dr0@netcom.com>

Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

Joe,

> The original post that resulted in all this discussion admitted their use  
> of the repeater WAS MALICIOUS. They were trying to interfere. All your  
> comments are moot!

Not moot - I was addressing a related issue, not trying to condone interference. Read my later posts for better context. Repetition, last time: I don't condone malicious interference.

Me:

> : If you insist on operating a system closed to all but a select few, it's up  
> : to you to secure it appropriately. If you took reasonable measures to secure

Joe:

> Totally disagree. A carrier operated repeater may properly be a closed  
> repeater. Obviously, someone who didn't know couldn't be held responsible  
> for any "interference" but if asked to leave, common courtesy dictates  
> they should. And if it is generally known that a repeater is closed,  
> shame on you if you just "accidentally" happen to talk on the input.

A closed carrier operated system sounds like an oxymoron to me, unless you have someone playing channel cop 24 hours a day. If you have several members who don't have a real life, maybe you can do that. I said in a previous post I wouldn't hang around if asked to leave, but neither you nor Mike have been able to give a single example of the FCC disciplining a ham for attempting to use an ostensibly closed repeater while otherwise following all regulations -- that is, using proper calling procedures and not causing deliberate interference to other users. (Of course, if no one ever answers a call I don't see why he'd hang around.) I help administer a few repeaters, and would be very interested in an actual case.

Perhaps you are confusing "the right to deny use of my equipment" with "the right to deny use of a frequency". You can do the first, but not the second -- and if the repeater is carrier operated, it does seem that you're trying to reserve exclusive use of the frequency.

It seems you and Mike are trying to invent an interpretation of part 97 that says that telling a user to go away is the same thing as restricting

access, and that if the user continues to make use of the repeater, he's guilty of interference. If the FCC has made that interpretation, it's news to me -- and I am aware of the latest ruling that reinforces the fact that there is no legal differentiation between "open" and "closed". If you have a example that does not involve malicious interference, please enlighten me. While I'm fortunate to live in an area almost free of closed machines, it appears from the postings in this group that the method most used to restrict access is an obnoxious attitude on the part of the owner. While somewhat effective in reality, I do question its legal value :-)

I think I've made several points at least twice over a few postings. I respect differing opinions on the subject, but my requests for an actual example of an FCC ruling that addresses my points have been ignored or countered by more whining from Mike about "welfare-statism". Let's see some facts -- we all know each other's opinions by now. I could be convinced of the legality of your viewpoint, even though I disagree with it, but I'd really like to see specific FCC example that states that merely accessing a "closed" repeater without the intent to maliciously interfere is/is not considered "interference" by itself.

73,

John, NK0R (I am not a lawyer, but find it fun to play the ham legal squabbles from time to time...)

-----  
Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 03:57:28 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
greg@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>,  
<2sp2nb\$pnb@nyx10.cs.du.edu>g  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sp2nb\$pnb@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:  
>

>In other words, "You pioneered the band. We're going to take it away from you.  
>Don't like it? Tough."

What isn't yours can't be taken away from you. The airwaves are a public resource. The fact that you were in the park first doesn't mean that you have the right to pitch your tent and make it your home.

>Da, comrade.

Red-Baiting as a form of intelligent argument disappeared in the 1950's. As a stupid diversionary tactic, it fell from favor in the 1970's.

In this area, too, Mr. Maynard needs to catch up with reality.

>> 1. He can open the machine; probably wouldn't change much,  
>> as the people who 'hang out' on the pair probably will  
>> continue to dominate it.

>

>You obviously haven't seen a trustee run off of his own repeater by an  
>invading crowd of users. I have. That's a Good Thing only if you're a  
>welfare-state communist..."from each according to his ability, to each  
>according to his needs". Feh.

Oh yes, I'm a dyed-in-the-wool Red. As must be anyone who advocates the outrageous notion that public resources made so by Act of Congress (radio spectrum) ought to be made available to the public, and be utilized at the pleasure of the public.

I might take your arguments seriously, Jay, if you didn't come across as a fringe lunatic who'd probably call Rush Limbaugh a pinko.

>> 2. He can salvage the support and control systems, and utilize  
>> them as the core of a new machine with different RF decks  
>> up on a less crowded band.

>

>The support and control systems pale in cost beside the RF - don't forget  
>antenna and duplexer as well as RF decks.

...and you can salvage the site, the single most valuable commodity.

>> 3. He can sell the machine to the organization who will run it.

>

>For a pittance; after all, they know he'll have no use for it.

Not necessarily. They may well be decent folks, like most hams. They may also realize that a working machine is worth a lot; you don't just run down to Sam's Used Repeater lot, after all.

>>Such is the price of progress.

>

>Da, comrade.

With this point, we see that Jay agrees. 'Da comrade' translates to 'I understand this to be true, and must concede you this point,' in his vernacular. It indicates that he has no response to the point, beyond his back-up Red-baiting.

>>Yes. That's true. And they moved up because there was a shortage of room  
>>on 144. Guess what? The problem followed. As it will inevitably follow  
>>them to 1.2Ghz, after maybe a few good years. Such is the price of  
>>exclusivity.

>

>They moved up as part of a bargain: "You put your stuff up on 440 and leave us  
>alone on 2." Now you're proposing to renege on that deal. Why should you be  
>trusted in the future to do anything but take, take, take, and steal?

Steal what? The frequency? How can one steal what can't be owned? The gov't  
gave us 200 meters and down in 1912. Have they 'renege' because they  
changed the rules a few times since then?

Nothing is forever, man. The deal really was 'you move to the upper end,'  
and leave us alone below.

Keep moving. Plenty of room, plenty of room.

>>On the other hand, if amateur radio as a whole decides that open machines have  
>>priority, and pre-emptive priority where necessary, with reasonable opportunity  
>>to move, then the courts won't support any self-serving fool who decides to  
>>buck progress.

>

>Are you prepared to defend that idea with your bank account, not to mention  
>your future livelihood? I sure as hell am not, and those are exactly the  
>stakes.

Gee, what a great hobby.

Greg

-----

Date: Sun, 5 Jun 1994 10:39:23 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2skp70\$qbc@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <1994Jun3.012445.4308@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CqwFtu.GGp@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

: In article <1994Jun3.012445.4308@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

: > Since open systems

: >don't place limits on who can use them, they make their chunk of spectrum

: >more accessable to more amateurs than closed systems do.



: Is this true? No open system places limits upon its users?  
: I thought the court case in SoCal was about the owners of an open repeater  
: trying to prevent two people from using it.

Actually, what really happened was that the repeater you reference, CLARA,  
first \*\*\*re-coordinated\*\*\* itself as CLOSED before commencement of the  
lawsuits, in recognition of the weak grounds for barring specific hams  
from an open repeater.

SNIP

--

rogjd@netcom.com  
Glendale, CA  
AB6WR

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #628

\*\*\*\*\*